

## EXHIBIT D

T

APR 13 1999

MARKOWITZ, HERBOLD,  
GLADE & MEHLHAFF, P.C.45446-7  
5/12

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE STATE OF OREGON  
FOR THE COUNTY OF MULTNOMAH

COREY K. FORD,

Plaintiff,

v.

GST TELECOMMUNICATIONS, INC., a  
Canadian corporation; GST TELECOM,  
INC., a Delaware corporation; PACWEST  
NETWORK, LLC, an Oregon limited  
liability company; JOHN WARTA, an  
individual; and STEPHEN IRWIN, an  
individual,

Defendants.

GST TELECOMMUNICATIONS, INC., a  
Canadian corporation, and GST  
TELECOM, INC., a Delaware  
corporation,

Cross-Claimants  
And Third Party Plaintiffs,

v.

JOHN WARTA, an individual; STEPHEN  
IRWIN, an individual; PACWEST  
NETWORK, LLC, an Oregon limited  
liability company; PACWEST  
NETWORK, INC., a Washington  
corporation; PCS PLUS HOLDINGS  
CORPORATION, a Delaware  
corporation; PCS PLUS PACIFIC, INC.,  
a Delaware corporation, and CLIFFORD  
SANDER, an individual,

Cross-Claim and Third-  
Party Defendants.

No. 9902-01746

ANSWER, AFFIRMATIVE  
DEFENSES, CROSS-  
CLAIMS, AND THIRD-  
PARTY CLAIMS OF  
DEFENDANTS GST  
TELECOMMUNICATIONS,  
INC. AND GST TELECOM,  
INC.

(Claim Not Subject to  
Mandatory Arbitration)

Page 1 - ANSWER, AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES, CROSS-CLAIMS, AND THIRD-PARTY CLAIMS  
OF DEFENDANTS GST TELECOMMUNICATIONS, INC.

BULLIVANT HOUSER BAILEY  
A Professional Corporation  
888 SW Fifth Avenue, Suite 300  
Portland, Oregon 97204-2089  
Telephone (503) 228-6351

EXHIBIT

D

PAGE

OF

4/12

1 Defendants, Cross-Claimants, and Third-Party Plaintiffs GST  
2 Telecommunications, Inc. and GST Telecom, Inc. (collectively, "GST") for  
3 their Answer to the Complaint of Plaintiff Corey K. Ford, admit, deny and  
4 allege as follows:

5 1.

6 Answering Paragraph 1, GST is without sufficient information or  
7 knowledge to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in  
8 Paragraph 1 of the Complaint, and on that basis, denies each and every  
9 allegation contained therein.

10 2.

11 Answering paragraph 2, GST admits the allegations of Paragraph  
12 2 of the Complaint.

13 3.

14 Answering Paragraph 3, GST is without sufficient information or  
15 knowledge to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in  
16 Paragraph 3 of the Complaint, and on that basis, denies each and every  
17 allegation contained therein.

18 4.

19 Answering Paragraph 4, GST admits the allegations of Paragraph  
20 4 of the Complaint.

21 5.

22 Answering Paragraph 5, GST admits the allegations of Paragraph  
23 5 of the Complaint.

24 6.

25 Answering Paragraph 6, GST admits the allegations of Paragraph  
26 6 of the Complaint.

12.

Answering Paragraph 12, GST denies having projected any value for the stock option package "Firm Option" referenced in Paragraph 12. GST also denies that the Agreement contained a provision specifying payment of liquidated damages in the amount of \$450,000 to Plaintiff in the event of premature termination of the Agreement. With respect to the terms of the Agreement, GST refers the court to the Agreement itself and denies any characterization thereof. GST is without sufficient information or knowledge to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations of Paragraph 12, and on that basis, denies each and every remaining allegation contained therein.

13.

Answering Paragraph 13, GST denies that it owed any duty to Plaintiff or that it dealt with Plaintiff unfairly. GST is without sufficient information or knowledge to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations of Paragraph 13, and on that basis, denies each and every remaining allegation contained therein.

14.

Answering Paragraph 14, GST admits that it advanced approximately \$14.5 million to Magnacom Wireless LLC, now known as PCS Plus (hereinafter "PCS Plus"), and received a contract for prepaid services in consideration for such advances. GST further admits that certain of its personnel and resources were advanced to PCS Plus, and that PCS Plus subleased office space in Vancouver, Washington from GST. At all times relevant to Plaintiff's allegations, GST believed that it was receiving or would receive full and fair consideration for such advances of personnel and

1                   **FOR A SEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**, GST alleges as  
2 follows:

3   56.

4   (Failure to State a Claim)

5                   Ford's claims are barred, in whole or in part, because he has  
6 failed to state a claim under Oregon or Washington law.

7  
8                   **FOR AN EIGHTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**, GST alleges as  
9 follows:

10   57.

11   (Illegality)

12                   Ford's claims are barred in whole or part because, if the  
13 Agreement is interpreted in the manner urged by Ford, such Agreement must  
14 be deemed illegal and unenforceable.

15  
16                   **FOR A FURTHER ANSWER, AND AS CROSS-CLAIMS AND**  
17 **THIRD-PARTY CLAIMS**, GST alleges as follows:

18   **INTRODUCTION**

19   58.

20                   Through this action, Plaintiff seeks to hold GST, among others,  
21 responsible for his frustrated expectations concerning his employment.  
22 Plaintiff's claimed entitlements arise from the employment agreement he  
23 executed with PCS Plus and PCS Holdings. The agreement was executed by  
24 Warta on behalf of both PCS Plus and PCS Holdings. Warta owns and  
25 controls each of these companies. Plaintiff alleges that Warta and Irwin, a  
26 PCS Plus officer and legal counsel to PCS Plus, each offered promises and

1 assurances to Plaintiff to induce him enter into the employment agreement.  
2 Thus, it is not surprising that Plaintiff named Warta, a company entirely  
3 owned by Warta, and Irwin as defendants in the present litigation. GST's  
4 connection to Plaintiff's situation is considerably less clear.

5 59.

6 GST is *not* a party to Plaintiff's employment agreement with PCS  
7 Plus and PCS Holdings, and has no relationship with Plaintiff. GST did not  
8 authorize Warta, Irwin, or any other GST officer or director to assume any of  
9 PCS Plus' obligations or to guarantee PCS Plus' performance in any way. If  
10 Warta, Irwin or others made any verbal representations to Plaintiff  
11 concerning GST, they did so because of their personal interests in PCS Plus  
12 and Warta's other alter-ego companies, and not for the benefit of or at the  
13 direction of GST. GST has received no benefit from Plaintiff's services or  
14 any of the conduct alleged in the Complaint. Indeed, GST has little or no  
15 knowledge concerning many of Plaintiff's allegations concerning his  
16 employment, and should not be made to satisfy the alleged obligations of the  
17 company that received the benefit of Plaintiff's services.

#### 18 JURISDICTION AND VENUE

19 60.

20 This court has jurisdiction over each of the cross-claims and  
21 third-party claims alleged herein pursuant to ORCP 4. Multnomah County is  
22 the proper venue for this action because Defendant Pacwest Network, LLC  
23 has its registered agent here and because the cross-claims and third-party  
24 claims alleged herein arise from the same events alleged in the Complaint.  
25 ORS 14.080.

1 **THE PARTIES**

2 61.

3 Cross-Claimants and Third-Party Plaintiffs GST

4 Telecommunications, Inc. is a Canadian Corporation with its principal place  
5 of business in Vancouver, Washington. GST is a leading facilities-based  
6 provider of advanced telecommunications products and services. The  
7 common stock of GST is traded on the NASDAQ. The Company currently  
8 operates telecommunications networks in 42 cities and has 2 additional  
9 networks under development. The Company has built fiber and switching  
10 infrastructures in selected cities in the western United States and is pursuing  
11 a strategy of linking the markets it serves via advanced long haul fiber optic  
12 networks. GST's integrated communications product and service offerings  
13 include Plain Old Telephone Service (POTS), analog trunk, private line, long  
14 distance, data (frame relay and ATM), paging, Centrex, and Custom Local  
15 Signaling Services (CLASS) such as call forwarding, caller I.D., voice mail,  
16 and automatic call back. GST also offers a full complement of Internet  
17 services, including dial-up, dedicated access, Electronic Data Interchange  
18 (EDI), and Web services. GST has no business operations in Canada.

19 62.

20 Cross-Claimants and Third-Party Plaintiffs GST Telecom, Inc.

21 ("Telecom") is a Delaware Corporation with its principal place of business in  
22 Vancouver, Washington. Telecom is a wholly-owned subsidiary of GST.

23 63.

24 Cross-Defendant John Warta ("Warta") is a resident of Clark  
25 County, Washington, and is, or was during the course of events described  
26 below, owner of Pacwest Network, Inc. and Pacwest Network, LLC

(collectively "Pacwest"); owner, both directly and through Pacwest, of PCS Plus Holdings Corporation ("PCS Holdings"); owner, through PCS Holdings, of PCS Plus; owner of Guam Net, Inc., now known as PCS Plus Pacific, Inc. (hereinafter "PCS Pacific"); President and Chief Executive Officer of GST; Chairman of the GST Board of Directors; a member of the GST Executive Committee; and a member of the Telecom Board of Directors.

64.

Cross-Defendant Stephen Irwin ("Irwin") is a resident of New Jersey, and is, or was during the course of events described below, a Vice-President of GST; a Director of GST; Vice-Chairman of the GST Board of Directors; a member of the Telecom Board of Directors; a member of the GST Executive Committee; a member of the GST Finance Committee; Secretary of GST; Vice President of Holdings; and an officer of PCS Plus; and counsel to GST, PCS Plus and PCS Holdings.

65.

Cross-Defendant PCS Holdings is a Delaware corporation with its principal place of business in Vancouver, Washington. PCS Holdings is a parent company to PCS Plus and its subsidiaries, including PCS Pacific, and is owned and controlled by Warta.

66.

Cross-Defendant Pacwest Network, LLC is an Oregon Limited Liability Company with its principal place of business in Vancouver, Washington. Pacwest Network, LLC is owned and controlled by Warta and maintains a registered agent in Portland, Multnomah County, Oregon.

67.

Third-Party Defendant Pacwest Network, Inc. is a Washington



corporation with its principal place of business in Vancouver, Washington.  
Pacwest Network, Inc. is owned and controlled by Warta.

68.

Third-Party Defendant Clifford Sander is a resident of Clark  
County, Washington and is, or was during the course of events described  
below, Treasurer, Chief Accounting Officer and Senior Vice-President of  
GST.

69.

Third-Party Defendant PCS Pacific is a Delaware corporation  
with its principal place of business in Vancouver, Washington. PCS Pacific  
is indirectly owned and controlled by Warta.

### THE FACTS

70.

GST's alleged involvement in or responsibility for the events  
described in the Complaint principally relates to the conduct of Warta, Irwin,  
and Sander. Plaintiff alleges that Warta, Irwin, and Sander represented to  
Plaintiff that PCS Plus was a front for GST, and that GST would stand behind  
PCS Plus with respect to its obligations to Plaintiff. Plaintiff further alleges  
that GST allocated personnel and resources for the benefit of PCS Plus. In  
truth, GST intended from the beginning to maintain an arms-length  
relationship with PCS Plus, and certainly would not and did not assume any  
responsibility for PCS Plus' support or obligations to its employees or other  
parties.

71.

If Warta, Irwin, and Sander did make the alleged promises or

1 representations to Plaintiff, they exceeded their actual and apparent authority  
2 as GST officers and directors in doing so, and no reasonable person would  
3 believe that Warta, Irwin, or Sander had the authority to bind GST to such an  
4 onerous unilateral obligation through mere oral assurances to a third party.  
5 GST is not a party to the Agreement; thus, GST's alleged obligations are  
6 claimed to result from oral statements alone, and not from any document  
7 executed on GST's behalf by Warta, Irwin, Sander, or any other GST officer  
8 or director. Moreover, GST had neither actual nor constructive notice of any  
9 such promises or representations and derived no benefit from Plaintiff's  
10 services.

11 72.

12 Similarly, if Warta, Irwin, and Sander improperly diverted GST's  
13 resources for the use of PCS Plus, they exceeded their authority in doing so,  
14 and GST has not waived its right to seek reimbursement for such resources  
15 from PCS Plus. GST intended and believed, at all times relevant to Plaintiff's  
16 allegations, that GST received or would receive fair consideration for any  
17 GST personnel or resources that were used for PCS Plus. Any GST personnel  
18 and resources that were used for PCS Plus without consideration for GST  
19 were diverted without GST's authorization or knowledge, and were diverted  
20 dishonestly and in bad faith by Warta, Irwin and Sander solely for their own  
21 benefit, and for the benefit of and on behalf of PCS Plus, Pacwest, PCS  
22 Holdings, and PCS Pacific.

23 73.

24 GST had no knowledge of or control over the actions of Warta,  
25 Irwin, and Sander with respect to PCS Plus during any period relevant to this  
26 litigation. Although GST has no knowledge of the matters alleged by

1 Plaintiff with respect to his employment, GST has been injured by the self-  
 2 serving ultra vires actions and conflicts of interest of Warta, Irwin and  
 3 Sander concerning PCS Plus. At the time that Plaintiff filed the Complaint,  
 4 GST already had claims relating to Magnacom (PCS Plus) pending against  
 5 Warta and Irwin in King County, Washington, and against Sander in Clark  
 6 County, Washington. GST has not authorized, endorsed, or adopted the  
 7 actions of Warta, Irwin and Sander concerning PCS Plus in any way, and is  
 8 vigorously pursuing claims against these individuals for their unauthorized  
 9 and undisclosed conduct in contravention of GST's interests. Pacwest, PCS  
 10 Holdings, PCS Pacific, and PCS Plus are each alter egos of Warta, and each  
 11 of these entities, along with Warta, Irwin and Sander, have been unjustly  
 12 enriched by such unauthorized and undisclosed conduct. Thus, Plaintiff's  
 13 allegations that GST is an alter ego of PCS Plus and PCS Holdings, and that  
 14 GST is responsible for any alleged representations or promises made by  
 15 Warta, Irwin or Sander with respect to PCS Plus, have no basis.

#### 17 FIRST CROSS/THIRD-PARTY CLAIM

18 (Indemnity)

19 (Against all Cross-Claim and Third-Party Defendants)

20 74.

21 GST incorporates the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1  
 22 through 74 above.

23 75.

24 GST did not authorize, condone, adopt, or have knowledge of any  
 25 of the promises and representations alleged in the Complaint to have been  
 26 made on GST's behalf or for GST's benefit. GST did not authorize, condone,

1 adopt, or have knowledge of any diversion of GST's resources without  
2 consideration for the benefit of PCS Plus as alleged in the Complaint.

3 76.

4 If Warta, Irwin or Sander made any of the promises or  
5 representations alleged in the Complaint, or caused the diversion of GST's  
6 resources without consideration for the benefit of PCS Plus, they exceeded  
7 the scope of their actual and apparent authority and acted dishonestly and in  
8 bad faith in doing so. Moreover, their actions violated fiduciary duties owed  
9 to GST, and they engaged in these actions solely for their own benefit, and  
10 for the benefit of and on behalf of PCS Plus, Pacwest, PCS Holdings, and  
11 PCS Pacific, and these entities were unjustly enriched thereby.

12 77.

13 If Plaintiff's alleged damages are proven at trial, Warta, Irwin  
14 and Sander shall have directly and proximately caused Plaintiff's damages for  
15 their own benefit, and for the benefit of and on behalf of PCS Plus, Pacwest,  
16 PCS Holdings, and PCS Pacific.

17 78.

18 If GST is held responsible for Plaintiff's alleged damages  
19 through this action, GST will be damaged thereby, and such damage will have  
20 been directly and proximately caused by Warta, Irwin and Sander for their  
21 own benefit, and for the benefit of and on behalf of PCS Plus, Pacwest, PCS  
22 Holdings, and PCS Pacific, each of which is an alter ego of Warta. Such  
23 imputed or vicarious liability for the unauthorized ultra vires conduct of  
24 Warta, Irwin and Sander in violation of their fiduciary duties to GST would  
25 be inherently inequitable. Thus, GST will be entitled to full indemnity from  
26 Warta, Irwin, Sander, Pacwest, PCS Holdings, and PCS Pacific for any

1 judgment against GST.

2 WHEREFORE, GST prays for relief as hereinafter set forth.

3  
4 **SECOND CROSS/THIRD-PARTY CLAIM**

5 (Implied Equitable Indemnity)

6 (Against all Cross-Claim and Third-Party Defendants)

7 79.

8 GST incorporates the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1  
9 through 78 above.

10 80.

11 As set forth above, if GST is held responsible for Plaintiff's  
12 alleged damages through this action, GST will be damaged thereby, and such  
13 damage will have been directly and proximately caused by Warta, Irwin and  
14 Sander, through their bad faith and dishonest conduct, for their own benefit,  
15 and for the benefit of and on behalf of PCS Plus, Pacwest, PCS Holdings, and  
16 PCS Pacific, and these entities will have been unjustly enriched thereby.  
17 Such imputed or vicarious liability for the unauthorized ultra vires conduct of  
18 Warta, Irwin and Sander in violation of their fiduciary duties to GST would  
19 be inherently inequitable, especially when PCS Plus, Pacwest, PCS Holdings,  
20 and PCS Pacific, who each benefited from such conduct, are alter-egos of  
21 Warta. Thus, GST will be entitled to full equitable indemnity from Warta,  
22 Irwin, Sander, Pacwest, PCS Holdings, and PCS Pacific for any judgment  
23 against GST.

24 WHEREFORE, GST prays for relief as hereinafter set forth.

**THIRD CROSS/THIRD-PARTY CLAIM**

(Contribution)

(Against all Cross-Claim and Third-Party Defendants)

81.

GST incorporates the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 through 80 above.

82.

As set forth above, if Plaintiff's alleged damages are proven at trial, Warta, Irwin and Sander, through their bad faith and dishonest conduct, shall have directly and proximately caused Plaintiff's damages for their own benefit, and for the benefit of and on behalf of PCS Plus, Pacwest, PCS Holdings, and PCS Pacific.

83.

GST has not caused and is not responsible for Plaintiff's alleged damages. Thus, if GST is held responsible for Plaintiff's alleged damages through this action, GST will be entitled to complete contribution for any judgment against GST from Warta, Irwin, Sander, Pacwest, PCS Holdings, and PCS Pacific, and under no circumstances will GST be entitled to less than pro rata contribution from each of the Cross-Claim and Third-Party Defendants.

WHEREFORE, GST prays for relief as hereinafter set forth.

///

///

///

///

**FOURTH CROSS/THIRD-PARTY CLAIM**

(Equitable Apportionment)

(Against all Cross-Claim and Third-Party Defendants)

84.

GST incorporates the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 through 84 above.

85.

As set forth above, if Plaintiff's alleged damages are proven at trial, Warta, Irwin and Sander shall have directly and proximately caused Plaintiff's damages for their own benefit, and for the benefit of and on behalf of PCS Plus, Pacwest, PCS Holdings, and PCS Pacific, and each of these entities shall have been unjustly enriched thereby.

86.

GST has not caused and is not responsible for Plaintiff's alleged damages. Thus, if GST is held responsible for Plaintiff's alleged damages through this action, GST will be entitled to equitable apportionment of any judgment against GST, such that the entire obligation for any such judgment shall be apportioned to Warta, Irwin, Sander, Pacwest, PCS Holdings, and PCS Pacific.

WHEREFORE, GST prays for relief as hereinafter set forth.

**FIFTH CROSS/THIRD-PARTY CLAIM**

(Breach of Fiduciary Duty of Loyalty)

(Against Warta, Irwin and Sander)

87.

GST incorporates the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1

1 through 86 above.

2 88.

3 Warta, Irwin and Sander, as GST officers and directors, each  
4 owed a duty of loyalty to GST. Pursuant to that duty of loyalty, Warta, Irwin  
5 and Sander were bound to avoid engaging in any acts or omissions  
6 inconsistent with GST's best interests, or from serving the interests of  
7 another entity at GST's expense.

8 89.

9 GST did not authorize, condone, adopt, or have knowledge of any  
10 of the promises and representations alleged in the Complaint to have been  
11 made on GST's behalf or for GST's benefit. GST did not authorize, condone,  
12 adopt, or have knowledge of any diversion of GST's resources without  
13 consideration for the benefit of PCS Plus as alleged in the Complaint.

14 90.

15 If Warta, Irwin or Sander made any of the promises or  
16 representations alleged in the Complaint, or caused the diversion of GST's  
17 resources without consideration for the use of PCS Plus, they acted  
18 dishonestly and in bad faith and for their own financial advantage based on  
19 their personal interest in the Warta entities. In doing so, they violated their  
20 fiduciary duties to GST. Any such activity was directly contrary to GST's  
21 best interests, and served the interests of other entities at GST's expense, in  
22 violation of the duty of loyalty.

23 91.

24 If GST is held responsible for Plaintiff's alleged damages  
25 through this action, GST will be damaged thereby, and such damage will have  
26 been directly and proximately caused by breaches of the fiduciary duty of



loyalty by Warta, Irwin and Sander for their own benefit, and for the benefit of PCS Plus, Pacwest, PCS Holdings, and PCS Pacific. Thus, GST will be entitled to recover its damages from Warta, Irwin, and Sander.

**SIXTH CROSS/THIRD-PARTY CLAIM**

(Breach of Fiduciary Duty of Care)

(Against Warta, Irwin and Sander)

92.

GST incorporates the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 through 91 above.

93.

Warta, Irwin and Sander, as GST officers and directors, each owed a duty of care to GST. Pursuant to that duty of care, Warta, Irwin and Sander were bound to exercise due care in conducting GST or other business in order to serve and protect GST's best interests.

94.

GST did not authorize, condone, adopt, or have knowledge of any of the promises and representations alleged in the Complaint to have been made on GST's behalf or for GST's benefit. GST did not authorize, condone, adopt, or have knowledge of any diversion of GST's resources without consideration for the benefit of PCS Plus as alleged in the Complaint.

95.

If Warta, Irwin or Sander made any of the promises or representations alleged in the Complaint, or caused the diversion of GST's resources without consideration for the use of PCS Plus, they acted dishonestly and in bad faith and failed to exercise due care to avoid injury to

1 GST and to serve and protects its interests. Any such activity was directly  
 2 contrary to GST's best interests, and served the interests of other entities at  
 3 GST's expense, in violation of the duty of care.

4 96.

5 If GST is held responsible for Plaintiff's alleged damages  
 6 through this action, GST will be damaged thereby, and such damage will have  
 7 been directly and proximately caused by breaches of the fiduciary duty of  
 8 care by Warta, Irwin and Sander for their own benefit, and for the benefit of  
 9 PCS Plus, Pacwest, PCS Holdings, and PCS Pacific. Thus, GST will be  
 10 entitled to recover its damages from Warta, Irwin, and Sander.

# 11 12 SEVENTH CROSS/THIRD-PARTY CLAIM

13 (Declaratory Relief)

14 (Against all Cross-Claim and Third-Party Defendants)

15 97.

16 GST incorporates the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1  
 17 through 96 above.

18 98.

19 As set forth above, if Warta, Irwin or Sander made any of the  
 20 promises or representations alleged in the Complaint, or caused the diversion  
 21 of GST's resources without consideration for the benefit of PCS Plus, they  
 22 exceeded the scope of their actual and apparent authority and acted  
 23 dishonestly and in bad faith in doing so. Moreover, their actions violated  
 24 fiduciary duties owed to GST, and they engaged in these actions solely for  
 25 their own benefit, and for the benefit of and on behalf of PCS Plus, Pacwest,  
 26 PCS Holdings, and PCS Pacific. Thus, GST is entitled to a declaration that

1 GST is in no way responsible for the conduct of Warta, Irwin or Sander,  
2 either on their own behalf or on behalf of PCS Plus, Pacwest, PCS Holdings,  
3 or PCS Pacific, relating to PCS Plus.

4 99.

5 WHEREFORE, GST is entitled to relief as follows:

6 a. For indemnity, contribution or apportionment such that  
7 Cross-Defendants and Third-Party Defendants shall satisfy any judgment for  
8 Plaintiff against GST in its entirety;

9 b. For GST's costs of suit, including reasonable attorneys'  
10 fees;

11 c. For further relief in the form of a declaration that GST is in  
12 no way responsible for the conduct of Warta, Irwin or Sander, either on their  
13 own behalf or on behalf of PCS Plus, Pacwest or PCS Holdings, relating to  
14 PCS Plus; and

15 d. Granting GST such other and further relief as the Court  
16 may deem just and proper.

17 DATED this 12th day of April, 1999.

18 BULLIVANT HOUSER BAILEY  
19 A Professional Corporation

20 By *R. G. Matson*  
21 Richard G. Matson, OSB #89302

22 BULLIVANT, HOUSER, BAILEY  
23 A Professional Corporation  
24 300 First Independent Place  
25 1220 Main Street  
26 Vancouver, WA 98660-2962  
Telephone: (360) 693-2424  
Facsimile: (360) 695-8504

1 WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI  
2 Professional Corporation  
3 DAVID S. STEUER  
4 JARED L. KOPEL  
5 650 Page Mill Road  
6 Palo Alto, CA 94304-1050  
7 Telephone: (650) 493-9300  
8 Facsimile: (650) 565-5100

9  
10 Attorneys for Defendants, Cross-Claimants and  
11 Third-Party Plaintiffs, GST  
12 TELECOMMUNICATIONS, INC. and GST  
13 TELECOM, INC.

14  
15 Trial Attorney: Richard G. Matson,  
16 OSB No. 89302  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that, on the date indicated below, I caused a true copy of the ANSWER, AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES, CROSS-CLAIMS, AND THIRD-PARTY CLAIMS OF DEFENDANTS GST TELECOMMUNICATIONS, INC. AND GST TELECOM, INC., to be served by facsimile transmission and by regular, first-class mail delivery, to:

Dennis P. Rawlinson  
Miller, Nash, Wiener, Hager & Carlson, LLP  
Suite 3500  
111 S.W. Fifth Avenue  
Portland, OR 97204  
(503) 224-5858  
FAX: (503) 224-0155

Peter H. Glade  
Markowitz, Herbold, Glade & Mehlhaf, P.C.  
Suite 3000 Pacwest Center  
1211 S.W. Fifth Avenue  
Portland, OR 97204-3730  
(503) 295-3085  
FAX: (503) 323-9105

DATED this 12<sup>th</sup> day of April, 1999.



Richard G. Matson, WSB #19641  
Of Attorneys for Defendants, Cross-  
Claimants and Third-Party Plaintiffs,  
GST TELECOMMUNICATIONS, INC.  
and GST TELECOM, INC.

\\CLIENTS\12368\8\PLDGS\ANSWER.DOC